THE

Hereſie and Hatred

Which was falſly Charged upon the

INNOCENT

Juſtly returned upon the

GUILTY.

Giving ſome brief and impartial Account of the moſt material Paſſages of a late Diſpute in Writing, that hath paſſed at *Philadelphia* betwixt

John Delavall and *George Keith*,

With ſome intermixt Remarks and Obſervations on the whole.

Printed and Sold by *William Bradford* at *Philadelphia*, Anno Dom. 1693.

Heresie and Hatred justly returned on the GUILTY, &c.

NOtwithstanding the many tendious and vexatious Disputes and Controversies that have been among us of late concerning Doctrines and Principles of Religion, one Party affirming, and the other denying, yet at other times in publick, *Thomas Lloyd* and Party, have endeavoured to cast a Mist before the People to make them believe, That there is no difference in Doctrine betwixt them and *George Keith*. But on the 11th of the 10th Month, 1692. being the first Day of the Week, in the Publick Meeting at *Philadelphia* before several Hundred People, *John Delavall* silenced that pretence, by accusing me *of being guilty of Works of the Flesh, in two particulars*, viz. *Heresie and Hatred*; using this as an Argument why I should not be heard, but my Ministry stopt and denyed: The Heresie whereof he accused was, *That I have been heard to affirm, That the Light within is not sufficient to Salvation without something else*. This he undertook to prove to be a *Heresie*, but not from any one place of Scripture, but from Friends Books, and particularly from a passage in *W. Penn*'s part of the Book called, *The Christian Quaker*, where he saith, *The Talent is in it self sufficient*.

Next, he undertook to prove me guilty of *Hatred*, because, as he said, *I had revised Friends, and falsly accused them in divers things*. But did not prove his Charge in any one particular.

And the said *John Delavall* hath divers times accused me in publick Meetings, *That he would prove me to be no* Quaker, *both from my own Books and the Books of Friends*. To which I replyed, That to prove me to be guilty of *Heresie*, and to be no *Quaker*, he ought first to begin with the Scripture, and prove me guilty of Heresie from the Scripture, and then let him proceed to prove it from my own and Friends Books.

Sam. Jenings replyed in the publick Meeting, *We are not to prove it from Scripture, but from Books Friends; for the Question betwixt us and* G. K. *is not, who is the best* Christian, *but who is the best* Quaker.

G. K. answered, If I am a good *Christian* I am a good *Quaker*, seeing the *Quakers* own themselves to be nothing else but true *Christians*. And also seeing, that we profess to own the Scriptures, and prefer them to all other Writings, ye ought to begin with the Scriptures, and from them prove me to be guilty of Heresie.

John Delavall did further accuse me, *That my Heresie and Error was in a Fundamental Doctrine of the* Quakers, *in saying, The Light within is not sufficient without something else.*

G. K. answered, I am glad to find the Controversie at last come to this plain issue, that ye and we differ in Doctrine, which ye would not acknowledge publickly before, but generally said, ye had nothing against my Doctrine, but against my Passion, &c. But now it plainly appeareth, that ye have against my Doctrine, and that ye and I differ *Fundamentally*. But however, *John Delavall* hath not proved it from any Friends Books, that I am guilty of Heresie; for tho' *William Penn* saith in the *Christian Quaker*, *That the Talent or Light within is sufficient in it self to Salvation*, yet he doth not say, it is sufficient without the Man Christ Jesus, and what he did and suffered for us on Earth, and without his present Intercession and Mediation for us in Heaven, which is that something else that I have affirmed to be necessary to our Salvation, together with the Light within, as one entire cause of our Salvation; and I can and dare appeal to *William Penn* in the case, who I hope is a living man, Whether his words bear any such sence, as J. D. would impose upon them, to prove me guilty of Heresie in a Fundamental Doctrine of the *Quakers?*

And for his Charge of *Hatred*, I told them, That it was no sin nor evil to hate mens Errors and Hypocrisie, and to bear a zealous Testimony against them; nor is it any Reviling to use sharp words of Reproof against the Guilty, unless ye will prove that I have falsly accused you in any thing, which ye can never do, tho' they have falsly accused me, as I can prove; and therefore both the *Heresie* and *Hatred* lyeth at your door. And ye have not been short in giving hard words against me, but have far exceeded me, as can well be proved.

It may be further observed, that several first Days one after another *John Delavall* brought to the publick Meeting his Pocket full of Books, interrupting me in my Testimony, and read passages out of the same, pretending he would prove by my own Books, that I contradicted my former Doctrine. To which I have answered, That it was an act of

Incivility

Incivility that both *J. Delavall* and his Brethren were guilty of, (as well as a Breach of the chief Fundamental Law of this Province, that requireth, That no man be disturbed in the practice of his Religion, tho' of a differing Perswasion, if he profess to believe in Almighty God) for them first to leave us, and then again to come in upon us, and in such a rude manner to interrupt and oppose me in my peaceable Testimony (sometimes crying out, We have heard an old Priest handle such a subject better than thou does; other times, Who does not believe this? what need thou preach this to us? And then again at other times, many of them at once calling out, This is airy Doctrine *George*, this is not according to antient Friends.) though I have interrupted none of them, nor intend to do; but on the contrary we sent a proposal to their Monthly Meeting, for them and us to confer about it, and see if we could accomodate the matter so as to prevent so great Confusion; and all the answer we could get, was, *That the Spirit of the Lord could not be limitted*; thereby making the Spirit of God the Author of so great Confusion as hath happened amongst us, that a Person of Note, living in *New-York* Province coming into the Meeting, compared it to a bull-baiting.

And I then told them further, That seeing *John Delavall* did proffer to prove me to contradict my former Doctrine, and to be no *Quaker*, I was most willing, and did desire that a day might be appointed for a Publick Dispute, wherein he might have opportunity to prove his Charge, if he could. To which *John Delavall* positively assented, without any reservation, restriction, or proviso; but sometime after being put in mind of it by me, in a Letter to him, he declined it, by making excuse, that he would dispute with me in publick, providing he had the consent of his Brethren. And on a First Day, some time after I pressing *J. D.* to perform his Promise, *Thomas Lloyd* said, He would not permit a publick Dispute, lest it should occasion a Tumult. But let the impartial Reader judge, whether this was not a meer Evasion, seeing they so constantly on a first day made Interruptions and Oppositions to me and my Testimony, which caused greater Confusion than ever was like to happen at a Dispute.

Therefore seeing that they declined a Dispute, to prove their Charge, I writ a few lines to *J. Delavall*, That whereas he had charged me to be guilty of Heresie and Hatred, desired him to make good his Charge against me. In answer to which he writes a Letter, dated the

the 16 of 10 Month, 1692. in which he doth acknowledge (but very mincingly) that he had charged me with *Hereſie* and *Hatred*, and doth poſitively ſay, [This being a Difference in a Fundamental Doctrine] withal promiſing to ſend in writing, what he had to ſay on the firſt head, *viz. That the Light within is not ſufficient without ſomething elſe*, which he calls Hereſie.

And in another Letter of his, bearing date the 3d of 11 Month, (referring to his Paper he ſent me the 24th of 10 Month,) he ſaith, "Wherein I have fully proved thee to differ in a Fundamental Do-"ctrine from thy former, and other Friends Writings. And further to prove me guilty of Hereſie, in the ſaid Letter, he giveth his ſence of the word *Hereſie*, as intended by him, when mentioned in the publick Meeting. "It is the ſame (ſaith he) as the Fathers (ſo called) "defined it: *Hereſie* is a miſ-belief of ſome points of Faith, contrary "to the Doctrine univerſally received in the Church.

To this his Definition of Hereſie, out of the Fathers (ſo called) as he alledged, I replyed to him, in a Letter bearing date the 2d of 12th Month, That his Definition of *Hereſie* ſeemeth rather to be taken out of ſome *Popiſh Writer*, than any approved antient Fathers (ſo called) further adding, That the beſt way to know what Hereſie is, is to examine it by the Spirit of Truth within, and the Teſtimony of the Scripture without, and to lay moſt weight on theſe two. But what hath been the univerſal Teſtimony of the Church in all Ages, or what it is at preſent, is far more hard and difficult in many things to determine, and too tedious to enquire into. But however, I doubt not but I have more the Conſent of the Univerſal Church for me, than againſt me, in this particular.

And in his ſaid Paper, bearing date 24 of 10 Mo. 92. wherein he alledgeth, That he hath fully proved me to differ in a Fundamental Doctrine from my former and other Friends Writings, he ſpendeth moſt of his Paper, containing about a Sheet and a half in Writing, citing particular Teſtimonies out of mine and other Friends printed Books, and particularly my Book of *Univerſal Grace*, pag. 7, 3, 4, 18, 56, 83, 94. and *G. F.*'s Book, called, *The Myſtery of the great Whore*, Epiſt. to the Reader, by *E. B.* & p. 19, 20, 21. and *W. Penn* in his part of the *Chriſtian Quaker*, p. 36, 85, 86. and *G. Whitehead* in his part of the *Chr. Quaker*, pag. 13, 31. and *Rob. Barclay* in his Engliſh *Apology*, printed 1678. pag. 101, 112, 115, & p. 96, 97.

To

To this I replyed in two Sheets of Writing, in a very Friendly way, in compliance with *J. D*'s expectation, having said in his Paper, *That he expected my Friendly Reply*, wherein I tell him, that I have diligently read over again and again all these Testimonies collected by him, out of mine and other Friends Books, and have diligently weighed and considered them, and find not the least inconsistency with them, and my late or present Doctrine, either in print or by word of mouth, nor with the Assertions he draweth from them, rightly understood; As 1*st*, That this Light wherewithal every man is enlightened with, is Christ Jesus; 2*dly*, That it is the very Grace of the Gospel, and Object of the Faith thereof (*viz.* chiefly, as with respect to the second Ministration thereof, the which lyeth hid within the first) 3*dly*, That by Belief in the Light, and Obedience thereunto, Salvation is obtained. And I further said, As I can freely appeal to such of them as are alive in the Body, whether their sense of their words bear *J. D*'s Construction, so I can uncerely say, it is a gross mistake of his, the Construction he puts upon my words, cited by him out of my said Book of *Universal Grace*.

And for a Proof that *John Delavall* had put a wrong Construction upon my words, as if my present Assertion, (*viz. That the Light within is not sufficient without the Man Christ Jesus, and his Death and Sufferings, and Mediation, &c.* which is that something else (as *J. D.* hath confessed) is understood by me) did contradict the Doctrine in that Book, I did refer for my Vindication to my said Book of *Univers. Grace*, 1*st part* stating the Controversie, *N.* 3, 4, 6. and *anf.* to 25 *Obj.* To which *J. D.* hath not given any Reply. And because the said places to which I have referred for my Vindication, are so plain and evident I earnestly recommend them to the Reader to weigh and consider at their full length, and only shall give a hint of things therein contained at present, for brevity's sake. In the 3d particular of the first part, I treat largely of the *Two inward Ministrations* of the Light within, *viz. Law* and *Gospel*, and that both in *Jews* and *Gentiles* universally, and how the Gospel lay hid within the Law, as within a Vail, even as the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies was within the outward Court. But this Distinction given by me of the *Two inward Ministrations* of the Light, as laid down in my said Book that hath been in print about 22 Years past, J. D. accuseth as a *Novelty*, as also my other Distinction of *Salvation begun* and *perfected*, according to the first and succeeding measures

measures of more Light and Grace, further to be given; sufficiently hinted at, *N. 6. 1 part* of said Book. And in the answer to *Obj. 29.* of said Book, I am so far from asserting the sufficiency of the Light within, so as to exclude the Man Christ, and the benefit of his outward Coming, Obedience, Death and Sufferings from having a part in our Salvation (together with the Light within) that I do expresly joyn them together, plainly affirming, That they are both sufficient and useful and necessary in their own kind and way, consummating, and being consummated in one another. It can hardly be construed to be inadvertency in J. D. but rather a wilful & deliberate Omission in him, thus to pass by what made so clearly to vindicate me, in my said Book, that so he might seem to have some Colour to pervert my words to a contrary sence from what was ever intended by me.

And whereas J. D. hath said in his Paper, *That he doth friendly intreat me, not to put a wrong Construction on his words, for accusing me of Heresie, as if he and his Brethren did exclude the Man Christ Jesus from having any part in our Salvation*; and doth oft earnestly affirm, both in his first and second Paper, *That neither he nor his Brethren exclude the Man Christ from having a part in our Salvation.*

To this I did answer, in my first Paper, That seeing he doth blame my Assertion, as being a Heresie, That the Light within is not sufficient to Salvation without something else, he must needs hold the Antithesis, or Contradictory, *viz.* That the Light within Is sufficient without any thing else, that is to say, in other equivolent Terms, without any thing [*beside*] [*more*] or [*other*] as the English Particle [*Else*] doth signifie: but this Assertion excludes wholly the Person of Christ, both the Body, and Fullness of Light, Grace and Truth that dwelleth in him, and his Death and Sufferings, &c. all which are somewhat else, are some-what other, or beside, or more, than the measure of Light in us, tho' Christ within and without is still but one Christ. And I did inform or put him in mind, that Contradictory Propositions lie not betwixt two Particulars, as some and some, But betwixt one Particular and the other Universal, the one affirming and the other denying. And therefore for J. D. to say, The Light within is sufficient without some-what else, is no Contradiction, for the Light within is sufficient without Thousands of some things else, but yet not without any or every thing else, for then it would exclude the Man Christ, and his Death and Sufferings, from having any part in our Salvation.

I

I further told him, That it could not be ſaid, that the Man Chriſt was the Light in us, otherwiſe than by a figurative Speech of a *Synecdoche* or *Metonyme* or *Allegory*.

And whereas *John Delaval* did mainly blame my Aſſertion, *That the Light within is not ſufficient without ſomething elſe, i. e.* the Man Chriſt Jeſus, 1*ſt*. Becauſe I ſaid in my Book of Univerſal Grace, *That the Light* (viz. within) *is the immediate Object of the Chriſtian Faith*: 2*dly*, That I ſaid, *It is inſeperable from God and Chriſt, as the Beams of the Sun are inſeperable from the Sun.*

To this I replyed, That I did not ſay, the Light within is the [*Only*] Object; and tho' the Light within, and the Man Chriſt without, and the Fullneſs of Light that dwelleth in him, be inſeperable one from another, yet the one is not the other; for things may be inſeperable, and yet the one not be the other, whereof I gave divers Inſtances, as Faith and Repentance are inſeperable, yet Faith is not Repentance: Remiſſion of Sin and Sanctification are inſeperable, yet Sanctification is not Remiſſion of Sin, but ſome-what elſe; and Chriſts glorified Soul and Body are inſeperable, yet his Body is not his Soul: The Godhead and Manhood of Chriſt are inſeperable, yet the Godhead of Chriſt is not his Manhood: The Meaſure and Fullneſs are inſeperable, yet the Meaſure is not the Fullneſs: The River and Ocean are inſeperable, yet the River is not the Ocean: The Beams and the great Body of the Sun are inſeperable, and yet the Beams are not the great Body of the Sun: Alſo, the glorified Saints in Heaven and Chriſt are inſeperable, yet they are not Chriſt, but Chriſt is ſome-what elſe. Moreover, I told him in my former Paper, that *G. F. E. B.* and *W. P.* do all diſtinguiſh betwixt the Meaſure and Fullneſs in the Teſtimonies mentioned, withall citing a Paſſage in *T. Ellwood's* Book, called, *The Foundation of Tythes ſhaken*, pag. 238. ſaying, *Nor do the* Quakers *aſcribe Salvation to the following the Light within, but they aſcribe Salvation to Chriſt Jeſus, to whom the Light within leads thoſe that truly follow it.* And he hath another obſervable Paſſage, pag. 240. *If any one expects Remiſſion of Sins by any other way than the Death of Chriſt, he renders the Death of Chriſt uſeleſs.* Thus *T. Ellwood.* And ſurely the Death of Chriſt is ſomething elſe than the Light within. And *W. Penn* in anſ. to *Faldo*, p. 192. ſaith, *The Light within is not God, but of God.* And neither *R. Barclays* words, cited by J. D. nor any others hold forth the ſufficiency of the Light, without the Man Chriſt Jeſus, that ſomething

elſe that I always affirmed to be concerned in our Salvation, together with the Light within.

And whereas J. D. in the laſt Leaf his firſt Paper layeth down ſix Heads, which he ſaith, he is willing to controvert with me. To this I replyed, that the four firſt of theſe Heads I will not controvert with him, for they are a part of my Teſtimony, and always owned by me, rightly underſtood; and for the two laſt, I will readily controvert with him, after the Controverſie about the Light is ended.

And in my firſt Paper I did further inform J. D. That my aſſertion, *viz. That the Light within is not ſufficient without ſomething elſe*; that ſomething elſe being the Man Chriſt Jeſus, and his Obedience, Death and Sufferings, Reſurrection, Aſcention and Mediation for us in Heaven, doth no wiſe infer the Light its being not ſufficient; and for J. D. to think it doth ſo infer, proceedeth from either his great Weakneſs or Inadvertency, not conſidering the Signification of ſuch or the like enunciative Propoſitions, giving divers full Examples, and particularly he that ſaith, Man is not ſufficient without the Grace of God, to work out his Salvation, doth not deny man to be ſufficient or able to do it, with and by the help of Gods Grace; and therefore, he who ſaith, the Grace of Chriſt or Light within is not ſufficient to ſave us without the Man Chriſt, doth not deny the Grace and Light of Chriſt is ſufficient, together with him. I further ſaying, That as God infinitely wiſe hath ordained divers concurring Natural Cauſes to produce one Natural Effect, all ſubordinate to him, the firſt and higheſt Cauſe; ſo to effect our Salvation he hath ordained divers concurring Cauſes, ſome without us and ſome within us, and every one ſufficient and able in their manner and way of working, to anſwer to the end and effect, all in Harmony together.

And becauſe J. D. in his former Papers had not ſtated aright the matter of Difference betwixt him and me, as concerning the ſufficiency of the Light within to Salvation, therefore I did ſtate my Perſwaſion concerning the ſufficiency of the Light, and alſo concerning the Scriptures being ſufficient to afford us words whereby to expreſs our Faith in all matters of Chriſtian Doctrine, in twelve ſeveral particulars. To which, as yet, J. D. hath ſent no particular Reply; therefore as to that the matter reſts at preſent. And this is a brief account of the moſt material Paſſages in the firſt Paper that J. D. ſent to me, and in the Reply that I made unto his ſaid firſt Paper.

In

To anſwer to my firſt Paper, which was writ in a very fair & friendly manner to *John Delavall*, he ſendeth me a ſecond Paper, by way of Reply, containing many bitter Expreſſions, unfriendly Reflections and falſe Accuſations, too tedious here to relate, but which will ſufficiently appear, if the Paper happen to be printed, moſt groſly miſ-applying that place of Scripture to me, *Ezek.* 18. 24. as if I were turned a wicked man; And why? Becauſe of my zealouſly oppoſing his and their Anti-chriſtian Doctrine, and detecting their Hypocriſie, Ignorance and Errors, even as Friends in *England* were called wicked men for their oppoſing and detecting the Ignorance, Errors and Hypocriſie of their Oppoſers.

To my former Reply, that I ſaid, The Light, (*viz.* within) is not the [*Only*] Object of Faith, J. D. doth anſwer, in his ſecond Paper, *That little leſs is affirmed by me*, *pag.* 6. where I blame our Adverſaries, that they do not hold it (*viz.* the divine Illumination of Chriſt within) to be the *immediate Object of the Chriſtian Faith.*

To this I anſwered, in my 2d Paper, That to ſay the Light within is the *immediate Object of the Chriſtian Faith*, is not to ſay, it is the *Only Object of the Chriſtian Faith*, excluding the Man Chriſt Jeſus, and his Death and Sufferings, Reſurrection, Aſcention, and Mediation for us in Heaven, which are owned generally by Friends, yea, and by J. D. though in Contradiction to himſelf, to be alſo the Objects of our Chriſtian Faith, ſeeing he expreſly granteth, That he and his Brethren do believe in the Man Chriſt Jeſus, and citeth *R. Barclay*, ſaying, *It is damnable Unbelief not to believe theſe things where declared.* ☞ *Note*, *R. B.* in his printed Letter to *H. Paets*, a *Dutch-man*, doth diſtinguiſh betwixt the *material* and *formal Object* of Faith, granting that Chriſts Death and Sufferings, Reſurrection, Aſcention and Interceſſion, *&c.* with other parts of Chriſts Doctrine, are the *material Object of Faith*, but affirming, that the divine Revelation of the Light within is the *formal Object* thereof: And therefore if J. D. were not blinded with Prejudice, he would ſee there is not the leaſt Inconſiſtency here. And tho' the word *Object* is not a Scripture word, yet it is uſed not only by *R. Barclay*, but by *J. Burnet*, ſee his Collection, printed 1691. in his Anſwer to *Ja. Barry*, pag. 212. where he ſays expreſly, *Therefore we expect he ſhould inform us what Goſpel he hath to preach to them Chriſt dyed not for, and what Object of Faith he hath to lay down for them to believe in; for Faith muſt have an Object:* Or whether they do not preſs it as a Duty

upon all to believe? and then let us know their Method of Diſtinction, who preach not the Goſpel to every one; for ſure there can be no Goſpel of Glad Tidings to them Chriſt dyed not for. Thus *John Burnyeat:* Where it is plain, that he underſtandeth Chriſts dying for all to be the *Object of our Faith*, and a Doctrine of the Goſpel, as well as that he doth inwardly enlighten all, as it was of that Goſpel which *Paul* preached, as it doth plainly appear from 1 *Cor.* 15. 1, 23. *Rom.* 10. 8, 9. 1 *Cor.* 1. 23, 24, 25. and many other places. And I put J. D. in mind how at the School-houſe Meeting, about 12 Months paſt, he brought the fore-cited place, *Rom.* 10. 9, 8. in oppoſition to *T. Lloyd*, his Father-in-Law, to prove that it was not ſufficient to Salvation, to believe only in the Light within, but to believe alſo that Chriſt dyed & roſe again; And to this, as to other things, I expect his particular Anſwer.

And I ſay ſtill, that Chriſts inwardly enlightening all, is a Doctrine of the Goſpel, and the Object of our Faith, as well as that Chriſt dyed for all. But I was ſo far from denying Chriſts coming the Fleſh, and his Death and Sufferings, to be any part of the Object of the Chriſtian Faith, in that Treatiſe of *Univerſal Grace*, cited by J. D. that pag. 92. I particularly mention *Chriſts Coming in the Fleſh, his Miraculous Birth, his Doctrine, Miracles, Sufferings, Death, Reſurrection, Aſcention, &c.* as being things of the Chriſtian Faith and Religion, which the Light within brings us to own; and the ſame upon the matter is confeſſed by J. D. in both his Papers: How then am I guilty of Hereſie, for ſaying the ſame that J. D. ſaith?

To my ſaying, that J. D. his blaming my Aſſertion, as being Hereſie, (viz. *That the Light within is not ſufficient without ſomething elſe*) doth oblige him to hold the Antitheſis or Contradictory Aſſertion, *That the Light within is ſufficient without any thing elſe.* J. D. Replyeth, *That is but my Conſequence, and none of his words.* To which I replyed, That ſome affirm, they heard him ſay ſo, in ſo many words; but ſuppoſe he did not ſay it, yet ſeeing he hath accuſed me of the former, the neceſſary & unavoidable Conſequence of his words makes it to be his, and to deny this, is to be guilty of the greateſt Trifling and Non-ſence that ever I knew in any pretending to common Reaſon. His ſcurrilous Reflection upon me, as abuſing my School-Craft, as he calls it, I paſs over, not valuing it, being conſcious of my ſincerity, and which I freely leave to the Impartial to judge.

For a Proof that *W. Penn* layeth not our whole Salvation upon the Light

Light within only, as ſufficient without the Man Chriſt Jeſus, I did cite *W. P.* in anſwer to *J. Faldo*, part 1. pag. 243. *J. Faldo* charging it upon the *Quakers*, *That they expect to be ſaved by the Light within only.* *W. P.* anſwers in behalf of the *Quakers*, This is a wicked Suggeſtion againſt us; ſee alſo his following words. And as I ſaid to J. D. in my 2d Paper, Now let the Impartial Reader judge, who hath any thing of common Reaſon, Whether by theſe words *W. Penn* doth not plainly declare his Mind, *That we are not ſaved by the Light within without ſomething elſe?* For as the word *Only* is excluſive, ſo are the words *Without ſomething elſe.*

And here let it be noted, that *John Delaval* finding that he could not make good his Charge againſt me, *viz.* his accuſing me of Hereſie for ſaying, *The Light within is not ſufficient without ſomething elſe*, he goeth about (moſt ſillily) to change the ſtate of the Queſtion; for whereas the ſtate of the Queſtion was, *Whether the Light within was ſufficient to Salvation without ſomething elſe*, viz. *without the Man Chriſt Jeſus, and his Death and Sufferings, and preſent Intereceſſion for us in Heaven*, he goeth about (not ſo ſlyly as ſillily) quite to alter and change it to another Queſtion, altogether different from the former, as *Whether any can be perfectly ſaved & made perfectly happy without all knowledge and faith of the Man Chriſt Jeſus without us, and of his Death and Sufferings, &c?*

To which I have anſwered him in my ſecond Paper, That theſe two are quite differing Queſtions; for if this laſt ſhould be granted, yet it ſtill remaineth, that the Light within only, without the Man Chriſt Jeſus, doth not ſave any; for even many who do not know him, nor believe in him (having ſome meaſure of ſincerity under the firſt Miniſtration of the Light within them) receive the benefit of his Death, and Sufferings, and Mediation (by the general acknowledgment of all that ever I have formerly known of the People called *Quakers*) at leaſt in ſome meaſure to begin a good work in them, as is clear in the caſe of *Cornelius*, before he received the Knowledge and Faith of Chriſt crucified and raiſed again; and therefore, as I have told *J. D.* he will ſooner waſh an *Ethiopian* until he be white, than he can prove me guilty of *Hereſie* or *Error*, for affirming, *The Light is not ſufficient without ſomething elſe*, either according to Scripture or ſound Friends. But to ſay, *The Knowledge and Faith of Chriſt, both as he is God and Man, and as he dyed for our ſins, and roſe again for our Juſtification, and is our*

Mediator

Mediator in Heaven, even the Man Christ Jesus, is necessary to finish and perfect the Salvation and Eternal Happiness of all that shall be Eternally saved, This doth no wayes derogate from the sufficiency of the *Light within*, for the Light within being God and Christ, is abundantly sufficient to reveal this Knowledge and Faith in all them who shall be saved, and that either without or with means, as God pleaseth, tho' in Gods ordinary way of working, he maketh use of outward means; and therefore if any have not the *Knowledge and Faith of Christ crucified*, as outwardly, this doth no more prove, that the *Light is not sufficient in it self*, than if any have not the *Faith* and *Obedience of the Light inwardly*, doth prove that the Light is not sufficient; for as J. D. hath confessed in his first Paper, *Faith and Obedience are the blessed Effects produced by the sufficiency of this Light in all his true Followers*; So that *Faith* and *Obedience*, with respect to the Light, are not the Cause of its Sufficiency, tho' it Then only comes to be sufficient to us, when we believe in it, and obey it. And thus, what J. D. affirms with respect to the *Light within*, I affirm also, with respect to *the Man Christ without us, as he dyed and rose again, and is our Intercessor in Heaven*; for, as not to believe in the Light within, is no argument of its *Insufficiency*, so not to believe in the *Man Christ without us*, is no argument *that the Light within is not sufficient to mens Salvation universally*, because the Light within being a real measure of the eternal Word, *Christ Jesus*, can as easily reveal the *Faith of the Man Christ without, and of his Death and Sufferings, &c.* as it can reveal the *Faith of Christ within*, both which J. D. doth acknowledge to be necessary to all such to whom it is preached or declared, for their Eternal Salvation.

John Delaval's silly Taunt and Reflection, *That I cause him not to staggar by my profound Logick*, (as he terms it) I regard not, further, (as I told him in my 2d Paper) but to take notice of his scoffing Spirit, more like *Ishmael* than a true *Christian* or *true Minister of Christ*: I used no profound Logick in the case, but one or two of the easiest and plainest Rules in that called Logick, belonging to the Rudiments of it, and as I told him, true Reason teacheth it, without all Art of Logick; but J. D. in meddling with that he calleth my Logick, hath shewed his profound *Ignorance* in common Reason.

His accusing me of *Pride, Fury and Rage*, I told him, is one of the Unclean Streams that flow from his Unclean Fountain; & so I pass it, with

with other his ſcurrilous Reflections and falſe Accuſations.

I alſo told him, his poſitively charging me with that he calleth *my late modelled Doctrine of the Revolutions*, is a baſe and vile Forgery and Calumny, which I have ſufficiently anſwered in my printed Treatiſe, called, *Truth and Innocency*, &c. I never made that (vulgarly) call'd the *Revolutions*, any matter of my *Chriſtian Faith*, and no man living can juſtly ſay, that ever I did: I can defend my *Chriſtian Faith* without the *Doctrine of the Revolutions*, as well as all other true *Chriſtians* can, who are of the ſame Faith with me concerning the *Neceſſity of the Knowledge and Faith of Chriſt crucified, to mens perfect Salvation.* Nor hath the Doctrine of the *two Miniſtrations*, and of *Salvation begun*, and *Salvation perfected*, a dependance on the *Revolutions*, ſo called, whether true or falſe; for what hath a dependance on another, is the Effect of that other; but the *two Miniſtrations of the Light within*, and the *Work of our Salvation*, both in its beginning and finiſhing, have no other Cauſe but *God*, and *Chriſt*, and the *Spirit*, and therefore wholly depend thereupon. And I freely at any time proffer to defend my Perſwaſion and Faith concerning the *Two Miniſtrations*, and *Salvation begun* and *finiſhed*, without running either to the *Papiſts Purgatory*, or the Hypotheſis of the *Revolutions*; and let *John Delavall* or any of his Aſſociates, try their ſtrength, whether they can drive me, by the force of their Arguments to any ſuch pinch or ſtrait, as he doth baſely inſinuate againſt me in his 2d Paper. And his Accuſations in this particular do not only ſtrike againſt me, but *G. F. E. B. W. P.* all whom I can prove to hold the diſtinction of *two inward Miniſtrations of the Light*, and *two ſtates of Men*, anſwering thereunto, the firſt of which G. F. calleth, *The ſtate of the firſt* Adam, *which he was in before he fell*, which he calleth, *A ſtate of danger, where he may fall again, but to come to Chriſts ſtature, and to him before the World began, who is firſt and laſt, beginning and ending, ſuch ſhall know a ſtate that will never fall*; ſee his printed Epiſtle, 1666. directed, *To be read in all the Aſſemblies of the Righteous*; and concerning this ſecond ſtate he ſaith further, *Chriſt that never fell is a ſtate beyond* Adam, *and he is to be heard and followed that never fell, and in him are People to ſit down, who is the Reſt, and Peace, and Life, who deſtroyeth the Devil and his Works, and maketh an end of Sin; now this being manifeſt and known in all, then the Lamb is known to have the Victory.* And a little after, ſpeaking of this ſecond ſtate, he ſaith, *And here, as you live in the Seed, Chriſt Jeſus, your Election you*

know before the World began, and Reprobation ſince the World began. And theſe two ſtates *W. Penn* plainly diſtinguiſheth in his part of the *Chr. Quaker*, calling the one that of the *Law*, the other that of the *Goſpel*, the one that of a *Servant*, the other that of a *Son*; and *E. Burrough* ſaith, pag. 56. of his Works in folio, *The Law muſt have its thorow Operation, before the Goſpel be witneſſed.* It is therefore manifeſt that *John Delavall* is greatly Ignorant, as in the holy Scriptures, ſo in the *Quakers* Principles, ſo to fault my Teſtimony concerning the *two Miniſtrations*, and *Salvation begun* and *Salvation finiſhed*, which *perfect Salvation* (according to G. F.) belongeth only to the ſecond State and Miniſtration.

And whereas J. D. in his 2d Paper maketh an Eſſay to ſhow, *That Propoſitions may be Inconſiſtent, that are not ſtrictly Contradictory the one to the other*, giving an Inſtance in four Examples. To this I have anſwered, That all theſe are Contradictory, being either betwixt *definite Particulars*, or ſuch as contain neceſſary matter of Truth and Falſhood, and therefore are ſtrictly Contradictory; but Propoſitions betwixt *Indefinite Particulars*, as *ſome* and *ſome*, are never Contradictory nor Contrary, nor have the leaſt Inconſiſtency, when the matter of them is not any neceſſary Truth and Falſhood, but are both True, as is the preſent caſe in our Debate; for as it is true, *That the Light within is* [*Not*] *ſufficient without ſomething elſe*, that ſomething elſe being the Man Chriſt Jeſus, and his Death and Sufferings, and Interceſſion for us in Heaven, ſo is it alſo true, *That the Light within* [*Is*] *ſufficient without thouſands of ſome other things elſe.* And if *Jo. Delavall* think not himſelf obliged (by the Law of Diſpute) to ſhow the *Antitheſis* or *Strict Contradictory Propoſition* held by him, (which is moſt proper) if he have not renounced all uſe of common Reaſon, he muſt ſhow the Propoſition that is (if not Contradictory) at leaſt contrary or inconſiſtent therewith; but it hath none other than that I mentioned to him in my firſt Paper, viz. *That the Light* [*is*] *ſufficient without* [*Any*] *thing elſe*; and this he muſt needs hold, unleſs he reſolveth wholly to unman himſelf; for it is the nature of all *Indefinite particular Propoſitions*, that they have no contrary but what is ſtrictly Contradictory, as is our preſent Caſe. And in my 2d Paper I put him in mind of the common Proverb, *Let not the Shoe-maker go beyond his Laſt*, not that I upbraid him with his Ignorance in the Art of Logick, but for his *Pedantick Vanity*, that he would ſeem to know what he is as ignorant of as a Child.

To

To his saying, *We never differed about the meaning of the Particle* [*Else*] I told him, he is grosly dis-ingenuous; for he knoweth the contrary in his Conscience; and he may remember, how that not long ago, when I was declaring in the publick Meeting, *That the measure of Christs Light in us, was not sufficient without the Fullness, that dwells in the Man Christ Jesus, and the Fullness was something more than the Measure*, *Sam. Jenings*, in the publick Meeting interrupted me, most uncivilly, as he hath at other times done, (tho' I have never interrupted him, nor any of them) and he cryed out, *Thou sayest*, George, *the Fullness is something* [*more*] *but is it something* [*else?*] To which I answered, Yea, it is something else; and therefore if *J. Delavall* had any thing of shame-facedness left in him, he might be asham'd of his Dis-ingenuity and dissimulation in this particular.

To his blaming me for saying, *The Man Christ was the Light in us, was a figurative Speech of Synecdoche, Metonyme or Allegory.* I answered him, That seeing he blames me for this, according to him, the Man Christ is within us, wholly, both Soul and Body, without all figure, with all his Fullness; which is as gross a Doctrine as the *Papists* is concerning the Man Christ being in the consecrated Cake. And I told him, that Christ, as God, was in us, without a figure, but not as Man, without some figure or figurative Speech of *Synecdoche*, *Metonyme* or *Allegory*. And as to his Citation out of one of my Books, *That where it is said in Scripture, that Rock was Christ, I denyed it to be a Figure*; my sence is plain, being in opposition to them who say, *That Rock was one really Christ, but only a Type or Figure of him*: Whereas I affirmed, That Christ was really with the Church in the Wilderness, and not only Typically & Symbolically or Figuratively; and so is Christ really now with and in his Church. And he blames me for giving some Examples of the Figure *Synecdoche*, used in common Speech, as if *I did apply them to Christ in us*; but I made no Application, and yet if I had, the Scripture, I told him, useth the like; for what is to be understood in Scripture by the Revelation of the *Lords Hand* or *Arm* in us, but the measure of his Life? And as in Scripture, Christ is compared to a *Garment that the Saints put on*, and is their *Cloathing from Head to Feet*, so he is said to put them on; and *Shoes* in Scripture have a spiritual Signification, as in *Cant.* 7. 1. *How Beautiful are thy Feet with Shoes!* And the Prodigal at his Return to his Fathers House, had *Shoes* put upon him, *Luke* 15. 22. And it was the Life of Christ that cloathed

the Prodigal at his Return to his Fathers Houſe, from his *Head to his Feet*; and therefore the Scripture uſeth the Figure of *Shoes* in a very high ſence, tho' this is as a ſtrange Doctrine to *John Delavall*'s profound Ignorance, who yet profeſſeth himſelf to be a Maſter in the *Iſrael* of his Ignorant Aſſociates and Hearers, who (belike) is the beſt and ableſt they can find to controvert with G. K. to prove him a Heretick, for his ſound Chriſtian Doctrine, well warranted both by Scripture, and ſound *Quakers*, yea, and all *Chriſtians* every where; for let all Profeſſions in *Chriſtendom* be ſearched, and it will not be found that ever any of them (owned to be true *Chriſtians*) condemned it as an *Hereſie* or *Error*, to ſay, *The Light within is not ſufficient to Salvation without ſomething elſe*, to wit, the *Man Chriſt Jeſus*; for as I told J. D. I never knew any hold Salvation by the Light within only, excluding the Man Chriſt Jeſus, but *Jeffery Bullock*, whom *G. Whitehead* has well refuted, ſee his book, call'd, *Judgment fixed*, pag. . where he ſays, *Thou who ſeeſt not the Conſiſtency betwixt Salvation by the Light within, and the Man Chriſt Jeſus, art gone from the Light into Imaginations*; and ſo (by *G. W*'s Judgment) are *John Delavall* and his Brethren that call it *Hereſie* to ſay, *The Light within is not ſufficient to Salvation without the Man Chriſt Jeſus*; wherein *John Delavall* and his Apoſtate Brethren fall in with *Jeff. Bullock*, for proof of which ſee the Judgment of their Monthly Meeting at *Philadelphia*, that cleareth *T. Fitzwater* and condemneth me, for ſaying, *The Light is not ſufficient without ſomething elſe*, which we have cauſed to be printed, with our Anſwer to it. Now I do boldly ſay, theſe men are fallen from the Fundamental Principle of the *Quakers* in this very particular, and are guilty of Hereſie themſelves, and yet would lay their Brat (Whore like) at my door, but I return it to him and them.

And notwithſtanding that *John Delavall* hath made an abſolute and poſitive Appeal to antient Friends in *Old England*, to determine in this caſe, I cannot eaſily be perſwaded, that after they have fully heard the Caſe truly ſtated betwixt J. D. and me, that ever they will approve his Doctrine, but on the contrary, if they hold to their former Principles, as I am charitable they do, they will condemn it, and blame his ſo medling, and all them that adhear to him, notwithſtanding of his Fawning and Flattery, whereby he ſeeketh to have their favour for his profeſſed Subjection to their Determination, which if it prove a Contradiction to what he at preſent thinketh is the dictate of the Infallible

fallible Spirit in himſelf, it ſhall be ſeen what manner of Perſon he is, and how unfit to teach others, that is not truly taught himſelf in one of the firſt Principles of the *Chriſtian Doctrine*. And notwithſtanding his fawning to have favour with Friends in *England*, he could not do a worſe thing to render Friends Odious, both in *England*, and every where elſe, to aſſert it as the *Quakers* Principle, *To be a Hereſie and Error in a Fundamental Doctrine, to ſay, The Light within is not ſufficient without ſomething elſe*, that ſomething elſe (as confeſſed by him) being the *Man Chriſt Jeſus without us, and his Death and Sufferings, and Interceſſion*; for if the generality of Profeſſors in *Chriſtendom* believe this to be the *Quakers* Doctrine, there cannot be a more miſchievous Stumbling block laid in their way, to hinder People generally from joyning in Society with them. Therefore I hope God will put it into the hearts of faithful Friends in *England*, and elſe-where, zealouſly to withſtand this moſt pernicious Anti-chriſtian Doctrine of *J. Delavall* and his Aſſociates, that ſay, *It is a Hereſie to aſſert* (this ſound Chriſtian Doctrine) *That the Light within is not ſufficient to ſave men, without the Man Chriſt without us*; for if ſo, then either there is no Man Chriſt without us, or he is no Saviour to us at all, and hath only the bare and empty Title of a Saviour, to wit, the *Man Jeſus of Nazareth*.

And tho' J. D. hath again and again aſſerted, *That by his ſo accuſing me, he doth not exclude the Man Chriſt Jeſus in the Outward, from having a part in our Salvation*; yet who can believe him, but he that can believe the greateſt Contradiction, which no man ever can do, that has not loſt his common Senſe and Reaſon, and is not become a Brute in Underſtanding. Beſide, if he doth not exclude him from having a part in our Salvation, as neither do I, but include him, then in what part of my Aſſertion lodgeth the *Hereſie*, that he hath charged upon me, for ſaying, *The Light is not ſufficient without ſomething elſe*, I confeſſing, that by ſomething elſe, I neither underſtand Humane Learning, nor the Letter of the Scripture, nor outward Preaching, as abſolutely and univerſally neceſſary, but the *Man Chriſt Jeſus*? And as great a Contradiction is it in J. D. to blame me for charging him, *That he holdeth the Meaſure to be ſufficient without the Fullneſs*; for if he holds not this, he muſt needs hold, *That the Light within is not ſufficient without the Fullneſs*, that is ſomething elſe than the meaſure of the Light within, or then he muſt hold two Contradictory Propoſitions to be falſe, as thus,

It is false to say, The Light is [*Not*] *sufficient without the Fulness,*
And
It is false to say, The Light [*is*] *sufficient without the Fulness.*

Which is an absolute Contradiction to all common Reason of Mankind; and I do solemnly say, that of all the Adversaries I ever had to do with in Dispute, I never met with a more Ignorant or more Unreasonable Adversary. And tho in a Letter to me (wherein he is concerned with some others) he falsly chargeth me, *as being either Crased, &c.* I appeal to all Impartial Readers of common Reason, Whether ever they heard or knew a man that seemeth more Crased than he. And to me it seemeth a Judgment of God upon him, to be so bewildered and confounded in his common Sense and Reason as a man, for daring to oppose so great a Christian Truth asserted by me, a poor Servant of the Lord, and to call it Heresie, he having lignally, and more than ordinary appeared but of late to joyn with me in the same Testimony, as I told him in my former Paper, how by his charging me with Heresie, he had unministred himself. To which he returns not any thing of sollid Answer, but instead thereof a silly Jest, not worth mentioning. And thus the Scripture is fullfilled in him, *Because they received not the Truth in Love, God gave them up to strong Delusions, to believe Lyes.*

To his saying, in his second Paper to me, *My Answer, that things which are inseperable, yet are distinct, giveth me no Relief.* I answered him, I need no Relief in the Case, my Examples were proper and pertinent, as that *Faith* and *Repentance* are inseperable, and yet we are not saved by *Faith* without *Repentance*, which he in his Ignorance laboureth to render Ridiculous, by the Addition of his own words, making them a Tautology. But he altogether passeth by my Example how *Christs Godhead* and *Manhood* are inseperable; and yet it is most congruous and proper to say, *The Man Christ cannot save us without his Godhead*, which Christ taught himself, expresly saying, *I can do nothing of my self, i. e.* without my Father. Also, it doth no more infer that I deny the sufficiency of the Light within, because I say it is not sufficient without the Man Christ without us, than it inferreth, that he that saith, *John Delaval* is not a Man without his Soul, denyeth J. D. to be a Man; Or, J. D. is not sufficiently honest without honest dealing, denyeth J. D. to be sufficiently honest; Or, because *Rich. Habberthorn*

Hubberthorn ſaid, *Chriſt is not Chriſt without God*, that Chriſt is not Chriſt; ſee his Collection, pag. 29.

As for his other Collections of Teſtimonies out of mine and other Friends Books, in his ſecond Paper, added to theſe in his former, as I ſaid before, I find none of them inconſiſtent with my preſent Doctrine, and if he think they do, I ſhall freely conſent to it, if he pleaſe, that he may expoſe them to the World in Print, or any other Papers he hath ſent me, that ſo Impartial Readers may judge betwixt us.

To his charging me, with *Gratifying ſome ill affected to the Government, and my Contentious Behaviour in Church and State*; I have anſwered him, His Accuſations is groſly falſe and malitious, and I reject it as ſuch; I have no way medled with the Government, but have born my faithful Teſtimony to Friends antient Principle, againſt the uſe of outward Weapons. It is no new thing for innocent men to be charged with being Enemies to Government, by men of his and their Spirit and Stamp; ſo were Friends charged in old *England*, at their firſt appearance, and particularly *G. F.* and ſo were the *Proteſtants* in *Germany*, and elſe-where, by the *Papiſts*.

In a third Paper I ſent *John Delavall*, in anſwer to his Letter, bearing date the 3d of the 11 Month, I did argue with him at great length, That if becauſe Chriſt without and Chriſt within are inſeperably one Chriſt, therefore it may be ſaid (according to him) that it is ſufficient to preach Chriſt within; as he and many of his Brethren argue, and that it is a Hereſie to ſay, *The Light within is not ſufficient without ſomething elſe*, viz. *the Man Chriſt Jeſus*. By the ſame Argument, It is ſufficient to preach Chriſt without, and it is a Hereſie to ſay, *The Man Chriſt is not ſufficient to Salvation without ſomething elſe*, viz. *the Light within*. And therefore by *John Delavall* and his Brethrens way of Argument, all theſe who have only preached Chriſt without, have been in the right, and all Friends who have blamed them, for not preaching Chriſt within, are blame-worthy; Why? Becauſe Chriſt within and Chriſt without are inſeperably one Chriſt. But to this, and many other things in my three Papers, I have received no Return. And as I have told him, I deſire not further to Diſpute with him thus in private, that is to little purpoſe, but am willing to commit to publick View, partly what is already paſt betwixt us, or what may further paſs, reſerving ſome other weighty things,

things, I ſent him in my former Anſwer, to another occaſion, as I may have Conveniency.

In the mean time let it be remembred, that he hath not brought one place of Scripture, in all his Papers, whereby to convince me, that I am guilty of Hereſie in the matter he accuſeth me.

And ſeeing the matter is come to this plain Iſſue, that they have now publickly charged me and my Friends joyned with me, of being *Guilty of Hereſie*, which formerly they did rather whiſper and mutter in Corners, and that it now openly appeareth in the face of the World, that they accuſe that to be Hereſie, which is a Fundamental Doctrine of the *Chriſtian Faith*, received, as we can prove, by *George Fox*, *George Whitehead*, *William Penn*, and the beſt of Friends, as well as by all *Chriſtians* in the whole World, it evidently appeareth, and moſt neceſſarily followeth, that the Hereſie is theirs, and they are Hereticks, and therefore our Seperation from them is juſt, and is a neceſſary Duty, we having oft admoniſhed them before, in private Conferences and Meetings, the Scripture ſaying, *An Heretick, after the firſt and ſecond Admonition, Reject.*

And thus having cleared my ſelf of *Hereſie*, the *Hatred* (no more than the Hereſie (he ſought to fix on me) doth not at all belong to me, and therefore I return both upon him, as his Due, until he Repent, which I can truly ſay, I ſincerely wiſh and deſire.

George Keith.

THE END.

The Printer's Advertiſement.

THat notwithſtanding the various Reports ſpread concerning my refuſing to Print for theſe that are *George Keith*'s Oppoſers, Theſe are to ſignifie, That I have never refuſed, but often proffered to Print any thing for them, and do now again ſignifie, that if *John Delavall* or any other of his Brethren have any thing to print, I am moſt willing to do it for them; not that I want to beg their Work, *I* need it not, but to leave them without Excuſe, that if they be any way wronged or falſly charged by what is publiſhed in Print to the World, they may have equal priviledge to Vindicate themſelves as Publickly; though *I* have little cauſe to make this Offer to them, conſidering their many Abuſes to me.

W. B.